1	WHEREAS, on June 10, 2009, the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict
2	Litigation centralized four actions before the Honorable Loretta A. Preska in the Southern
3	District of New York, captioned In re Merrill Lynch Auction Rate Securities Litigation, 1:08-cv-
4	3037-LAP; Community Trust Bank, Inc. v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., 1:09-cv-
5	5403-LAP; Louisiana Stadium & Exposition District, et al. v. Financial Guaranty Ins. Co., et al.,
6	1:09-cv-5404-LAP; and The Cooperative Bank, et al., v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith,
7	Inc., 1:09-cv-5405-LAP (the "Centralized Actions");
8	WHEREAS, on July 31, 2009, Plaintiff filed in this Court its complaint (the
9	"Complaint") in the above-captioned action (the "Action");
10	WHEREAS, on August 14, 2009, Defendants Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. and Merrill
11	Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., filed a Notice of Tag-Along Action with the United States
12	Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ("MDL Panel"), seeking to transfer the Action for
13	coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings with the Centralized Actions currently pending
14	before Judge Preska in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York;
15	WHEREAS, on September 1, 2009, the Clerk of the MDL Panel entered a Conditional
16	Transfer Order conditionally transferring the Action to Judge Preska in the Southern District of
17	New York;
18	WHEREAS, on September 15, 2009, defendant Deutsche Bank Securities Inc. ("DBSI")
19	filed a notice of opposition to the September 1, 2009 Conditional Transfer Order;
20	WHEREAS, on September 16, 2009, the MDL Panel issued a stay of its September 1,
21	2009 Conditional Transfer Order pending the resolution of DBSI's opposition;
22	WHEREAS, on September 24, 2009, DBSI filed a motion pursuant to
23	28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) seeking to transfer the Action to the Southern District of New York, but not
24	seeking consolidation with the Centralized Actions ("DBSI's Transfer Motion");
25	WHEREAS the procedures applicable to the Centralized Actions, as enumerated in the
26	Stipulation and Revised Scheduling Order signed by Judge Preska on August 17, 2009 (attached
27	hereto as Exhibit A), require defendants to inform plaintiff by letter of what they believe to be
28	any deficiencies in the complaint before filing a motion to dismiss and allow plaintiff the

2

opportunity to amend the complaint after receiving the letter;

3

Now, therefore, the Parties, through their respective undersigned counsel, hereby STIPULATE, AGREE, and JOINTLY REQUEST the following:

4 5 1.

By October 15, 2009, each Defendant will deliver to Plaintiff a letter enumerating what it believes to be the deficiencies in the Complaint that will form the bases for its motion to dismiss. With respect to any Federal Securities law claims, such letters shall focus on Second Circuit law, and not Ninth Circuit law.

7 8

9

6

By October 22, 2009, Plaintiff will notify Defendants whether it intends to amend the 2. Complaint, with the understanding that, except as provided in Paragraph 6 below, Defendants do not currently intend to consent to any further amendments.

10 11

12

13

If Plaintiff notifies Defendants that it will not amend the Complaint, Defendants will 3. answer or otherwise move in response to the Complaint no later than: (a) 20 days after Defendants' counsel receive notice that the MDL Panel has filed the Conditional Transfer Order in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; (b) 20 days after an Order is entered should this Court transfer this Action to the Southern District of New York under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a); or (c) 30 days after an Order is entered

14 15

16

should this Court decline to transfer this Action to the Southern District of New York.

17 18

4.

or otherwise move in response to the Amended Complaint no later than 25 days after

19

service of the Amended Complaint. However, in no event shall Defendants be required

If Plaintiff notifies Defendants that it will amend the Complaint, Defendants will answer

20 21

to answer or otherwise move in response to the Amended Complaint until: (a) 20 days

22

after Defendants' counsel receive notice that the MDL Panel has filed the Conditional

23

Transfer Order in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York;

24 25

(b) 20 days after an Order is entered should this Court transfer this Action to the Southern District of New York under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a); or (c) 30 days after an Order is entered

26

should this Court decline to transfer this Action to the Southern District of New York.

27

28

5.

transferred to the Southern District of New York either by the MDL Panel or pursuant to

If any Defendant elects to move to dismiss the Complaint and this action has been

1 DBSI's Transfer Motion, such motion will not raise any arguments not set forth in that 2 particular Defendant's Deficiency Letter. 3 6. If (a) Plaintiff gives notice pursuant to Paragraph 2 above that it does not intend to amend the Complaint, (b) this Action has not been transferred to the Southern District of New 4 5 York, (c) any Defendant makes any argument not included in that particular Defendant's Deficiency Letter in a motion to dismiss, and (d) Plaintiff seeks to amend its Complaint, 6 7 then such Defendant will consent to Plaintiff's amendment of the Complaint. 8 7. In the event that any Defendant elects to move to dismiss the Complaint or the Amended 9 Complaint, Plaintiff will serve an opposition to that particular motion to dismiss no later 10 than 45 days after service of that motion to dismiss. That particular Defendant shall have 11 30 days to serve any reply to Plaintiff's opposition. 12 Dated: October 5, 2009 Respectfully submitted, 13 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 14 15 /s/ Sara B. Brody 16 SARA B. BRODY 17 Of counsel: 18 Andrew W. Stern Alex J. Kaplan 19 astern@sidley.com ajkaplan@sidlev.com 20 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 787 Seventh Avenue 21 New York, New York 10019 Telephone: (212) 839-5300 22 Facsimile: (212) 839-5599 23 Attorneys For Defendants Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. and Merrill Lynch, 24 Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated 25 26 27 28

Document336 Filled100056099 Frace4 4 fof 75

Dated: October 5, 2009 Morgan, Lewis, & Bockius LLP 1 Jami Wintz McKeon Elizabeth A. Frohlich 2 /s/ Elizabeth A. Frohlich 3 Elizabeth A. Frohlich 4 Attorneys For Defendant 5 Deutsche Bank Securities, Inc. 6 **Arent Fox LLP** Dated: October 5, 2009 Robert C. O'Brien 7 Steven E. Bledsoe Antoinette Waller 8 9 By: /s/ Antoinette Waller Antoinette Waller 10 Attorneys For Defendant Money Market 1 11 Institutional Investment Dealer 12 Dated: October 5, 2009 Saveri & Saveri, Inc. R. Alexander Saveri 13 Geoffrey C. Rushing Gianna Gruenwald 14 /s/ R. Alexander Saveri 15 R. Alexander Saveri 16 Attorneys For Plaintiff Louisiana Pacific Corporation 17 18 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 20 21 Dated: October 6, 2009 22 23 United States District Judge 24 25 26 27 28

Case 3::09-cv-03529-JSW Document356 Filed1100056099 Frage 55fof 75